

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/087,574 | Applicant(s) HARRINGTON ET AL. |
| | Examiner Forest Thompson Jr. | Group Art Unit 2765 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Forest Thompson Jr./Eric Stamber

(3) Rob Farris

(2) Myles Harrington

(4) Keith Rothfus

Date of Interview Aug 16, 2000

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

BiDCOMP/PARITY articles were discussed from a prior IDS.

Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

Articles describing the BiDCOMP/PARITY system.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

See attachment

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Subject: Applicant Interview on 16 August 2000 on Patent Application 09/087,574 (Harrington et al.):

Mr. Farris explained the issues necessitating this meeting, connected with the subject application as concerned prior art, as he saw them. He stated that there were discrepancies between publicized claims and statements of BiDCOMP/PARITY and the disclosures by users and/or others; these discrepancies pertained to the capabilities of BiDCOMP/PARITY and the timeframe that BiDCOMP/PARITY had certain attributes.

In an article in Government Finance Review, dated February 2000, the time scale of the development of the MuniAuction System (the invention of Harrington et al.) is described. The MuniAuction System debuted in late 1997, according to the article. Two new bid submission systems (Thomson Financial Group's BiDCOMP/PARITY and Bloomberg Deal-o-matic) followed in 1998.

Harrington et al. has a filing date of May 29, 1998, and a priority date of May 29, 1997.

Mr. Farris et al. stated that they will submit an amendment this week that clarifies their invention and specifically claims its features which are unique over prior art. The response will address the conflicting information concerning BiDCOMP/PARITY features and that the overwhelming balance of the evidence points toward BiDCOMP/PARITY not having the claimed features before the priority date of applicants.